



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Deval L. Patrick
GOVERNOR

Timothy P. Murray
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Ian A. Bowles
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1181
<http://www.mass.gov/envir>

September 14, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
ESTABLISHING A SPECIAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

PROJECT NAME: Harvard University – Allston Campus 20-Year Master Plan
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY: Boston
PROJECT WATERSHED: Boston Harbor
EEA NUMBER: 14069
PROJECT PROPONENT: Harvard University (through the Allston Development Group)
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR: August 8, 2007

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G.L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Section 11.09 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby establish a **Special Review Procedure (SRP)** to guide the MEPA review of this project. In separate Certificates also issued today, I have determined that this project requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and have proposed to grant a Phase 1 Waiver for the Science Complex portion of the project.

Project Description

As outlined in the Expanded Environmental Notification Form (EENF), the 20-year Master Plan to accommodate the growth of Harvard's campus in Allston envisions the redevelopment of currently underutilized, predominantly industrially-zoned land, and creation of a pedestrian-friendly campus environment. Harvard's current Allston campus contains approximately 140 acres and is located predominantly on land bounded by Soldiers Field Road and Western Avenue, with North Harvard Street separating two distinct areas of the existing campus, the Harvard Business School and the athletic area. The growth of Harvard's campus in Allston over the next 20 years is expected to involve an additional approximately 85 acres of land, increasing the size of the Allston campus to approximately 215 acres

The construction of four to five million square feet (sf) of building space is anticipated over 20 years. With the exception of the Science Complex and a proposed Art Center (the review of which has been sequenced to follow the review of the Science Complex), no specific projects have yet been identified, nor is the timing or sequence of the 20-year Master Plan known at this time. The EENF presents a master planning framework to guide the orderly development of the campus as a whole, seeking to accommodate Harvard's anticipated institutional needs in a manner which is compatible with adjacent uses, neighborhood needs, and with master planning efforts initiated by the BRA in conjunction with the Allston community.

SPECIAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

The Proponent has filed an Expanded Environmental Notification Form (EENF) for the Master Plan for the Allston campus. The size and complexity of this project combined with its long-term timeline and undefined future phases, warrant the establishment of a Special Review Procedure (SRP). I believe that a SRP for this project will benefit the environment and serve the purposes of MEPA by providing meaningful opportunities for public review, analysis of alternatives, and consideration of cumulative environmental impacts.

As outlined below and in the Certificate on the EENF, the Proponent will file a 20-year Master Plan for the Allston campus in fulfillment of the MEPA requirement for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Master Plan will include an overview of the site development proposed, an analysis of existing resources on the site, and an analysis of potential cumulative impacts from site development and identification of any potential conflicts or incompatibilities among proposed uses. A finding of adequacy for the Master Plan shall indicate that sufficient information exists on cumulative impacts, background conditions, and master planning issues to allow individual project elements to proceed to more detailed MEPA review.

The Proponent will prepare more detailed information on the specific projects proposed under the Master Plan in the form of Project Commencement Notices (PCNs) and Notices of Project Changes (NPCs). PCNs and NPCs will be submitted to MEPA for state agency and public review. State agencies will not be able to take required agency actions for individual projects on the Allston campus until MEPA review on the PCNs and NPCs is complete. Specific guidelines for subsequent filings are provided in more detail in this Certificate.

Master Plan

In a separate Certificate issued today, I have issued a Scope for an Environmental Impact Report that will serve as the Master Plan for site development. The Master Plan will include all projects proposed over the next 20 years. The Master Plan will discuss projects for the ensuing 30 years solely for context. The Scope for the Master Plan will include, but not be limited to, the following items:

- A description and analysis of campus-wide existing conditions, infrastructure and natural resources.
- A campus-wide consideration of impacts related to land alteration, stormwater, wetlands, water quality, drinking water, wastewater, and historic resources.
- An analysis of existing transportation infrastructure, potential impacts and proposed improvements. The traffic scope will conform to the BRA/Boston Transportation Department Scope for the Institutional Master Plan (IMP) to the extent possible; however MEPA notes that the build out of the Master Plan project area will result in impacts to state roadways and parkways. The traffic scope will therefore be guided by comments from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). Since the Proponent has not defined the sequence and timing of specific Master Plan projects, the implementation of traffic mitigation measures will be tied to specific levels of trip generation from projects in any sequence.
An analysis of existing energy infrastructure, potential impacts and proposed improvements, including a discussion of existing air quality and potential impacts.
A discussion of the Proponent's commitment to sustainable design and the maximization of energy performance in new buildings.
- Background information on any projects that have completed MEPA review before the submission of the Master Plan (i.e., Science Complex if Phase I Waiver is granted, and any other projects); interim uses of Harvard-owned land outside of the Master Plan boundaries; and plans to potentially relocate the Charlesview apartments.

I reserve all rights granted to me by Section 11.08(8) of the MEPA regulations regarding determinations of adequacy of the Master Plan. A finding of adequacy for the Master Plan shall indicate that sufficient information exists, at a level appropriate for a Master Plan, on cumulative impacts, background conditions, and master planning issues to allow the individual project elements to proceed to more detailed MEPA review. A finding of adequacy for the Master Plan does not mean that sufficient information exists on individual elements for state permitting agencies to take any required Agency Actions on the project or its individual elements.

Subsequent Filings

The Proponent will provide Interim Updates to MEPA every three years. These documents should include an update on the status of area-wide infrastructure improvements and individual development projects within the Master Plan project area and a description of any significant changes to the Master Plan from that described in the Master Plan. The Interim Updates should analyze the cumulative impacts of all built and proposed development in the Master Plan area and update the status of all mitigation commitments identified in the Section 61 Findings for the Master Plan and all individual projects to date. The Interim Updates will be noticed in the Environmental Monitor for public comment. MEPA will issue a Certificate on the interim update and the Proponent may be required to provide a Response to Comments.

The first Interim Update should provide information in response to the requirement that the proponent monitor the effectiveness of TDM measures applied to achieve a 50% mode share for single occupancy vehicles for the Science Complex. If the results of the monitoring indicate

that the 50% mode share target has not been achieved, the Proponent must commit to additional mitigation measures.

Once the Master Plan is determined adequate, the Proponent will file a Project Commencement Notice (PCN) for each individual project that is programmatically consistent with the uses and densities in the approved Master Plan.

- PCNs will be noticed in the Environmental Monitor for public review.
- If the impacts of the individual project described in the PCN are below mandatory thresholds at 301 CMR 11.03 for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), there will be a presumption that no further MEPA review will be required for the project. The Secretary maintains the discretion to require further review if appropriate.
If the impacts of the individual project described in the PCN exceed mandatory EIR thresholds, there will be a presumption that a Single EIR will be required for the project. The Secretary maintains the discretion to determine whether or not a Single EIR would be appropriate.
- No PCNs will be required for tenant relocations, building demolition or supporting infrastructure if consistent with the approved Master Plan.

Once the Master Plan is determined adequate, the Proponent will file a Notice of Project Change (NPC) for projects that are materially different from the approved Master Plan or for a project on a site not included in the Master Plan area, as follows:

- NPCs will be noticed in the Environmental Monitor for public review.
- If the impacts of the individual project described in the NPC are below mandatory EIR thresholds, there will be a presumption that no further MEPA review will be required for the project. The Secretary maintains the discretion to require further review if appropriate.
- If the impacts of the individual project described in the NPC exceed mandatory EIR thresholds, the Proponent will prepare a Supplemental EIR.

The EENF indicated that the proponent may seek approval for the construction of a proposed art museum subsequent to completion of approvals for the Science Complex. If this occurs prior to completion of MEPA review of the Master Plan, the Proponent shall file a NPC to analyze the cumulative impacts of art museum and Science Complex. If the cumulative impacts of the art museum and the Science Complex exceed Mandatory EIR thresholds, the NPC shall provide an EIR level of detail; in the alternative, I will allow the Proponent to file the corresponding BRA review document for the art museum in fulfillment of the requirement for an EIR, provided that the document meets the standards for the preparation of an EIR at 301 CMR 11.07. If the cumulative impacts of the art museum and the Science Complex do not exceed Mandatory EIR thresholds, I will determine the adequacy of the NPC using the criteria for a Phase 1 Waiver.

Each project-specific filing must be circulated to all commenters on the Master Plan EIR and any previous filing on the specific project (for an EIR) or under Section 11.16 of the MEPA

regulations (for a PCN). State permitting agencies may take any required Agency Actions for a project element(s) after a finding either that 1) the PCN or NPC for that element(s) does not require further MEPA review or 2) that the EIR for that element(s) adequately complies with MEPA. There will be no NPC required for lapse of time (301 CMR 11.10(2)) for twenty years.

Citizens Advisory Committee

Given the size and complexity of this project, I hereby establish a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to assist me in reviewing the project. I note that in January 2006, City of Boston Mayor Thomas M. Menino announced a revised Harvard-Allston Task Force to serve as an advisory group to the BRA as Harvard undertakes its institutional master planning process for the Allston campus, and I am aware that the Harvard-Allston Task Force has devoted extensive time and energy to the review of Harvard's development proposals. Based on consultation with and the concurrence of the BRA, I propose that the existing Harvard-Allston Task Force, supplemented with a limited number of additional representatives to assist in the state's review of Master Plan impacts, serve the function of the CAC. Accordingly, to ensure that the CAC is diverse in affiliation and experience and fairly represent a range of viewpoints, I will accept nominations prior to the issuance of the Final Record of Decision.

In recognition of the size and technical complexity of materials that will be provided by the proponent to the CAC for its review and comment, the proponent has made a voluntary commitment, which I therefore require through this Certificate, to provide the CAC with financial resources to assist the CAC in obtaining third-party peer review of technical materials developed by the proponent that pertain to the issues of transportation, energy, and air quality. While third-party review will support the CAC's work, it will also provide a significant benefit to review by my office and the BRA. Accordingly, I am creating a selection and oversight committee to select and manage the third-party peer review consultants. The committee will be comprised of the Chair of the CAC or his or her designee, and representatives of the MEPA office and BRA.

The CAC shall participate in the review of review documents called for in the Special Review Procedure, and in the Proponent's review of detailed scopes of service for the consultant and preliminary review of the consultant work product. If the Proponent does not already do so, I am requiring that the Proponent provide staff support to the CAC such as secretarial services, keeping of minutes, mailings, and arrangement of meetings.

The CAC shall establish its own schedule of meetings. The CAC may establish working groups on particular aspects of the Project or issues within the Scope. The CAC shall be entitled to meet monthly with the Proponent and its consultants and shall be kept informed of progress on any review document called for in the Special Review Procedure. The CAC may direct questions concerning the Special Review Procedure to the Proponent or the Secretary.

The Proponent shall ordinarily submit a draft of any review document called for in the Special Review Procedure to the CAC at least one month prior to filing the review document with the Secretary. The CAC may suggest changes or additions to the review document prior to

the Proponent filing the review document with the Secretary. The CAC may file its comments with the Secretary prior to or when the Proponent files the review document with the Secretary. The CAC shall present a consensus in its comments to the extent to which its members have reached a consensus, although it may present the diverse views of its members when consensus has not or cannot be attained. The Proponent shall distribute any comments of the CAC or its members with the filed review document, provided that the CAC or its members file the comments with the Secretary prior to the Secretary publishing notice of the availability of the filed review document in the Environmental Monitor.

Conclusion

The Proponent's signature below indicates consent to the establishment of a Special Review Procedure and the specific provisions outlined in this Certificate.

Date

Ian A. Bowles
Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

Date

IAB/BA/ba